

We feel much gratified by the flattering compliment to our "ingenuity," from the Editor of the Louisville Journal, even though his admiration is somewhat qualified by the declaration that our reasoning is "inexpressibly ridiculous." For one who has shown such power over the ridiculous, as is displayed in the leader of the Journal, of the 18th instant, to pronounce such a judgment is peculiarly trying. But we must even be content to take the compliment of the Journal with such qualifications as it may choose to append, and to leave to a candid public the task of deciding which of us twin exerts the greatest control over the realm of the ridiculous. Such a task we opine will be an easy one.

Some weeks ago we published an article on the subject of squatter sovereignty, designed to explain Mr. BUCHANAN's position on that vital question, and to reconcile the alleged inconsistency existing between his letter of acceptance and the principles of the Cincinnati platform. Subsequently, within a few days past, we continued our argument on this subject, and showed conclusively, as we believe, that, according to every fair rule of construction, Mr. BUCHANAN's views were such as should commend him to the support and confidence of every Southern Democrat. To this conclusion the Louisville Journal has thought proper to object, and our argument it has thought proper to ridicule.

In order to sustain its position, the Journal has "ingeniously" (we return the compliment) garbled our article, and made us assert "that the platform which Mr. BUCHANAN accepted does not affirm the doctrine of squatter sovereignty, and that, therefore, Mr. BUCHANAN could not possibly have intended to affirm it, and certainly does not, however explicitly his language may appear to do so." Such an attempt, the Journal argues, would be like explaining away the vile heresies of Sumner and Giddings by showing that the Constitution, which they have sworn to support, does not sustain them, and so it would. But is it not strange that the ingenuity which suggested this admirable illustration, did not warn the fated Journal from falling into the very pit which its fancy had dug for us. For what, says that consistent journal? It commences with Mr. BUCHANAN's letter, argues from his language that he is in favor of squatter sovereignty, and from that premise deduces the conclusion that the platform which Mr. BUCHANAN endorses, also recognizes that principle. We would not misquote the Journal. Let us hear him speak:

"It might be doubted whether squatter sovereignty or State sovereignty was the doctrine affirmed by the terms of the platform, but Mr. BUCHANAN, in mounting that political scaffold, has taken occasion, by springing this particular plank, to render clear what before was doubtful. And he has done it in an unmistakable manner as to leave no further doubt behind. The real character of this plank in the Cincinnati platform is now as palpable and glaring as the sun at noonday. It is squatter sovereignty to the core."

Now such is the language of the Journal—and thanking it for the Sumner and Giddings illustrations, we ask, in all candor, whether the inference drawn in the above extract is not about as absurd, nay "ridiculous," as to infer that the Constitution sustains the heresies of abolition, because it is endorsed by men who sustain them; and that the bible teaches the monstrous precepts of Parker and Beecher, because Parker and Beecher believe in the Bible. So much for the Journal's mode of argument.

But we never used the language imputed to us by the Louisville Journal. We contended that the principles of the platform on this subject were unequivocal, and indisputable. That by its very language, the platform repudiated the doctrine of squatter sovereignty. That Mr. BUCHANAN fully endorsed that platform—that his own well known views previously expressed, sustained this opinion, and his own language elsewhere, threw a flood of light upon the true meaning of his letter, and that we were, therefore, justified in the belief that Mr. BUCHANAN maintained the southern conservative view of this question.

But the Journal affects to deny that the Cincinnati platform repudiates the doctrine of squatter sovereignty, and asserts in broad round terms that the "platform is intentionally non-committal upon the subject of squatter sovereignty. It neither affirms nor denies. It pretermits. It evades." Now really Mr. Journal, this is not even "ingenious"—it is simply and ineffably "ridiculous." But we would not deal in such harsh terms without reason, and so we call the attention of the public (not the Journal, it is past all hope) to the resolution of the platform on this subject.

"Resolved, That we recognize the right of the people of all the Territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of a majority of actual residents, and, whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a constitution, with or without domestic slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States."

Can anything be more explicit? Can anything be less "pretermitted"? Can anything be less "evasive"? This decision must be expressed by a majority of actual residents. Clearly nothing can be more republican. It must only be expressed when the number of inhabitants justifies it. Who shall decide on the requisite number? Surely no power within the territory, else you render the language nugatory, for a number however small may thus consider themselves large enough to meet the requisition, and, if outside the territory, where can the power be lodged but in Congress. It must be legally expressed. And by whom must the law authorizing its expression be adopted? By Congress, say we; because Congress having the sole power to admit new States, can alone decide when the legal steps have been taken to authorize their admission. It must be by a constitution, the highest sovereign act of a sovereign people, not by the mere determination of an unorganized and dependent people. And, finally, when all this is accomplished, the territory shall be admitted

WASHINGTON SENTINEL.

TRI-WEEKLY.

VOL. 3. NO. 130.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, TUESDAY MORNING, AUGUST 5, 1856.

into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States. Now, this last clause of the resolution is pregnant with importance, as showing, that even in as carefully worded a resolution as this the word "territory" is used as expressive of that inchoate sovereign condition, when the unorganized people of the territory throw off their dependence and are for the first time classed as a "State." It is but fair to presume, and any candid mind will decide, that in the use of the word "territory" by Mr. BUCHANAN in his letter of acceptance, he intended to convey the idea of a territory so organized, and, legally authorized to take this important step from dependence into sovereignty.

So much, for the soundness of the platform on squatter sovereignty. Is not the language conclusive and unequivocal? In all candor, we appeal to the editor of the Journal whether the platform does not "deny" the doctrine which he pronounces, and justly pronounces, revolting to the South? And now we would apply the mode of reasoning of the Journal to itself, and out of its own mouth would we judge it. If it be legitimate to infer that because Mr. BUCHANAN is unsound on this subject, therefore the Cincinnati platform, which he endorses, is unsound, is it not equally legitimate to infer that if the Cincinnati platform is sound on this question, Mr. BUCHANAN, who endorses it, must be equally sound. We admit that such reasoning is not to our taste. We admit that it is "ridiculous," but it is the reasoning selected by the Journal, and perhaps not the least adapted to its faculties because it is ridiculous.

But fortunately we are not left to inference or conjecture on this vital point. Mr. BUCHANAN's record on this as on every point connected with the canvass is without a blemish. He himself has explained his meaning of the phrase "people of a Territory" to be precisely that which we have attached to it. "Undoubtedly the people of the Territory assembled in convention to form a State constitution, and ask admission into the Union; and not the first adventurers or 'first comers,' who might happen to arrive in the Territory assembled in public meeting." [Sandford letter.] In other words: "The people of the Territory, acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of a majority of actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it."

Nor is the Louisville Journal less fortunate in the description of the disease, than in the suggestion of the remedy. We are gravely advised, as Southern men, as Republican Democrats, as sound statesmen, to fly from the leprous touch of Mr. BUCHANAN, into the healthful arms of MILLARD FILLMORE. Old adages are often used to express wholesome truths by extravagant hyperbole. Those we have heard of jumping out of the frying pan into the fire. Thus have we been taught the folly of swapping the devil for a witch. And thus the divine Shakespeare himself has made his philosophic madman exclaim—

Who would on this fair mountain leave to feed
And batten on this moor.

But all this extravagance becomes tame, all this hyperbole becomes ellipsis, compared with the absurdity of leaving Mr. BUCHANAN, because of his unsoundness on the subject of squatter sovereignty, and flying for comfort and support to the European nominee of the American party. We had not intended saying a word about this very estimable ex-President. We had not intended to revert to those palmy days, when, beneath a banner representing JAMES K. POLK, mounted by a woolly headed caricature of Texas, he denounced the annexation of the lone star under a yellow, than an allusion to those long records of Congress, wherein the name of FILLMORE is enrolled with the names of Giddings, and Adams, and Slade—we had not intended contrasting the free will with which, in 1850, he annulled the Missouri Compromise by his signature to the New Mexico bill, with the indignant vehemence with which he denounces the repeal of that compromise in the Nebraska-Kansas bill. We do not regard Mr. FILLMORE as our chief opponent in this canvass. But as his name has been alluded to in connection with this subject, we would simply commend to our Louisville contemporary the entire record of MILLARD FILLMORE in connection with the slavery question. Let it ponder his record well, and when it has come to a conclusion, let it learn to cast the beam out of its own eye, and then possibly, despite its federal jaundice, it may see clearly to cast the mote out of its brother's eye.

THE PRESS AND THE CANDIDATES.

In the days of Gen. Jackson, a favorite mode of electioneering by the opponents of the Democratic party, was the enumeration of newspapers favoring respectively the Democratic party and the Opposition. And, truly, had victory depended upon the number of papers respectively supporting the pretensions of each party, the Opposition would have had good reason to claim a triumph; but it turned out on every election that although the opposition had three papers to one, they had hardly more than one third of the votes.

In a similar manner votes were taken on steamboats, railroads, and watering places, and Gen. Jackson was always beaten at these barbed tests, beaten everywhere, except at the ballot box, and never beaten there.

A moral may be drawn from this lesson. In regard to the press an anomalous state of things has always existed and now strikingly exists. For instance, in the city of New York the Black Republicans, out of some 60,000 votes, cast about 6,000. Yet they are represented by the Daily Times, Evening Post,

New York Herald, Courier and Enquirer, and the Tribune, and some four or five other papers, having an aggregate circulation of a million, and receipts of many millions of dollars, drawn mainly from Democratic pockets, while the News and Day Book, Democratic papers, eke out a starling life, powerless to do good for want of a circulation.

We may extend these remarks to Philadelphia and Baltimore, where similar spectacles are exhibited.

It is a shameful fact that the Democratic party by subscriptions and advertisements, nowhere give life, vigor and effect to their papers.

The New York Journal of Commerce is only incidentally political; it, too, gained its position by opposition to the Democratic party, having of late only taken strong national conservative ground. We rejoice to believe it continues to receive a remunerating support, and has a circulation which can give good effect to its counsels, of late so sound and wholesome.

If the Democratic party would come to the support of a good Democratic journal, and give to it as it ought, a subscription of a million of subscribers, and proportionate advertising, a paper could spring up overshadowing all others in the world, being issued morning and evening, and each number containing matter, in all branches of knowledge, business and politics, and edited in every branch of it by the men of the first ability.

It would soon force an immense circulation in Europe. To the establishment of a Democratic paper of this character, there are parties in command of millions who are ready to embark, whenever its feasibility is determined.

Hitherto the strength of the Democratic party has depended, mainly, upon men's instincts, but the country has become so widely extended, so many local and side issues distract the country, that there should, perhaps, be some common source to which to look for reliable information.

We may find occasion to pursue these views with further comment, and leave them for the present to a general digestion.

A FALLACY.

The assertion, that the framers of the Constitution contemplated slavery only as a temporary condition, and so treated it, has been so often made, and is still daily repeated and urged, even by men whose character gives them claim to the merit of sincerity, that we propose briefly to notice this singular fallacy.

The question which presents itself at the very threshold of this matter, is, how long was that "temporary condition" to last—at what moment to cease?

That its inception was not to commence from the formation of the Constitution, and to be shortly consummated, is perfectly clear from that provision in the Constitution which peremptorily prohibits any attempt to stop its illimitable increase for twenty years. And as also appears by that other clause, which enjoins on Congress in perpetuo to make provision for the restoration of fugitive slaves.

By the phraseology of the Constitution, even after the expiration of twenty years, authority to stop the continued influx of slaves is only permissive; and unless their successors had availed themselves of the permission thus given, the influx of slaves would have continued to this day.

Had the desire to have slavery a temporary institution prevailed in the convention, and it had been the purpose of the convention to render it temporary, the constitutional clause relating to this subject would have given to Congress permission to legalize the slave trade for twenty years, and no longer, that at the expiration of that time it should not be lawful for Congress to legalize the trade, but that henceforth it should be piracy.

The very reverse of this is the fact, the Convention made most stringent provisions for securing the continuance of the slave-trade for at least twenty years, and forever after that, unless Congress specially interfered to end it; and nowhere in the Constitution is there any intimation that Congress was expected to do so.

Certainly the making provision for the doubling and quadrupling the number of slaves bears on its face no evidence of a purpose to make slavery a temporary condition; or, if temporary, still the ending of it must have been a long time off, or else the introduction of a million of negroes, would only serve to speckle the country with free negroes, a population not coveted by any.

But, above all, do the provisions in the Constitution, in regard to slavery, wear in any degree the aspect of compulsion in bringing about an abolition of slavery in this country.

If the Constitution be national, or any clause in it be so, then slavery is national. If the national flag protected it on the high seas, where we have no exclusive jurisdiction, why will not the same flag protect it in the Territories where we have exclusive jurisdiction?

Suppose California had at that time been part of our territory, and slaves from Africa had been imported into San Francisco, and transported eastward, would the protection of the American flag which had covered the property in strange lands, on the common ocean, fail at the very moment of reaching American soil; if not, would it endure during the passage (from San Francisco to the States) over the territory? Would confiscation or abolition have followed if the owners chose to remain in California with their slaves?

If slavery was not legal in the Territories, the Missouri Compromise would have given permission to slavery south of 36° 30', instead of prohibiting it north of that; for if illegal, prohibition was unnecessary.

All the facts of history conflict with the idea

that the Constitution or its framers considered slavery as a temporary condition. They did all in their power to leave it untrammelled, and to be determined by posterity for itself.

A VIEW OF THE CASE.

We have, a short time since, made the statement in our columns, showing that it could hardly be within the bounds of probability that the Black Republican nomination could receive more than one-third of the votes of the Free States. If, then, to the two-thirds of the votes of the Free States, we add the entire vote of the fifteen Southern States, it will very readily be seen what a small fraction of the American people are disposed to engage in a wicked crusade against the Constitution, the rights and equality of Southern States, and against the existence of the Union.

The tergiversation of the principles of this party is not the only monstrous feature presented for condemnation, but also the mode or terms on which they expect to attain power.

We have reason to suppose that their organization has originated, and has been based upon such a calculation as the following. There are, or were already two parties in the field—the Black Republicans could not, and did not expect a single vote from the South—with the entire South against them, and two powerful parties already absorbing two-thirds of the Northern States, the question was, how could the Black Republicans expect by possibility to secure an election of their nominee. A plurality in each State of one vote only would transfer to them the entire vote of the State, giving to their one-third the entire influence and advantage of the two-thirds opposed to them. Suppose the entire vote of the Free States to be three millions and sixteen votes. That of these the Democrats should have one million, Fillmore one million, and Fremont one million and sixteen.

To these two millions of Northern votes, add the Southern vote of two million five hundred thousand, and we will have an aggregate opposition to the Black Republican vote of four million five hundred thousand against their one million and sixteen votes.

And yet General James Watson Webb says, that if they cannot poll even these few votes necessary to their success, that this pitiful fraction, probably one-half the vote thus allowed them, they will "with fire and sword drive back the slaveocracy," although his own party numbers but a fourth of the voters of the country.

Suppose they get this fraction necessary to success, and then what an aspect does the case present?

A small fraction of the American people obtain possession of the Government, avowing principles which are considered by the immense majority alike subversive of the Constitution, of the rights of many States, and of the peace and welfare of the nation.

Under such an aspect, Mr. Fillmore has well asked, "if it can be expected that three-fourths of the people of this country will submit to the mad and revolutionary government of a prodigal and thoroughly corrupt minority."

The ranks of this party are indebted for a large portion of its numbers to the leaven of schemes for gigantic systems of plunder alike of the domain as of the Federal Treasury.

This pitiful fraction of our people hold out the assurance of a renewal and continuance of the most bitter and frantic sectional agitation, which must disturb all the relations of the States and inevitably affect the value of property and of labor to the extent of countless millions.

The promise of the Black Republicans, in case of success, is that of Lucifer, should his host succeed in storming Heaven—all the fell passions of human nature would be let loose to rage in unappeasable discord.

How differently does the Democratic nominee announce the result of his election.

How truly he says, "That the agitation of slavery has been productive of no good to any human being." Should not this suffice to allay it and to stay it forever?

He adds, with painful truth: "It has alienated one portion of the Union from another—it has substituted hate and discord for mutual regard and esteem—it has palmed the South in its well-meant and earnest endeavors to bring to the consideration of slavery the wisdom and justice of their best men, and to treat the subject as wisdom and justice should dictate." But the furious, ungoverned, and malignant interference of the North has been productive of injury alike to the slave, to his master, and to the harmony which made this nation one family.

The Black Republican party promises hellish discord, and nothing else. That is the only fruit of their success to the nation at large. The promises of plunder, which alone gives strength and adhesiveness to the party, is a secret cement applied in darkness and not intended to be visible to the public eye. Without this Masonic tie, they would be *disjuncta membra*, incongruous, unofficer, and undisciplined.

No man in his private interests can look hopefully with any reasonable confidence to an administration whose paramount motives of action are discord and plunder.

If the Democratic party be successful, every one will know that slavery in legislation will be ignored, and that, therefore, there will be no fear of "southern aggression." They will be as free from legislation in favor of slavery as if Fremont himself were elected. What more can people ask? If, with this peace is secured, have we not everything?

One of our most fashionable bakers, on being shown a specimen of the Bread Tree, rejected it with scorn, saying contemptuously, "Call that bread! Pshaw! Why there's no alum in it."

It therefore only remains to inquire what course shall be taken to rebuke sectional fanaticism and preserve our country from the dangers of its success.

You are aware that this Republican party

LETTER OF HON. THOMAS G. PRATT, OF MARYLAND.

Below will be found a truly statesmanlike letter from Senator Pratt to his fellow-Whigs of Maryland. It takes irrefragable positions justifying his and their support at the coming election of the Democratic nominees.

It states briefly that Mr. Fillmore abandoned his Whig friends and went over to the American party, which denounced the Whig party; that Mr. Fillmore accepted the nomination as of the American party; that he did not consult his Whig friends, nor appeal nor refer to them in his acceptance; that, in fact, he made himself a voluntary separation from them, consequently there can be no claim by him to their support.

The letter shows that the Fremont party is organized for the express purpose of attacking the rights and interests of Maryland.

That, allowing to Mr. Fillmore every merit claimed for him, it is clear as noonday that he cannot be elected.

That it is equally clear, that with the aid of the Whigs the nominees of the Democratic Convention can certainly be elected, and that thus the conspirators against the peace, interest, and honor of the South, will be defeated.

That the old issues between the parties are obsolete.

That to vote for Mr. Fillmore, in the South, is only a diversion in favor of Fremont.

TO THE WHIGS OF MARYLAND.

In response to the communications received from many of my brother Whigs, I deem it my privilege, in this manner, to counsel with all in relation to the course which patriotism and duty would seem to indicate as proper in the present political crisis.

No lover of his country whose judgment is unbiased by party zeal and uncontrolled by Northern or Southern fanaticism can fail to see and deprecate the pending danger to the Union.

The first duty of every man who loves his country and her institutions is to provide for their safety. The life of the nation is in danger. It must be saved; and, not till then, will it be permissible to us to discuss our differences of opinion upon minor subjects.

I say that the life of the Union is in danger, because, for the first time in our history, a party has been formed composed exclusively of citizens of one section of the country, bound together by the single bond of an alliance for offensive warfare against the other section. That the success of such a party would imperil the Union has been recently demonstrated by an address of Mr. Fillmore, and will, it is submitted, be apparent to all who will bestow a moment's consideration upon the existing posture of political affairs.

The value of the slave property of the South is not less than two thousand millions of dollars, and equal to one-fourth of all the other property in the United States, as shown by the last census. This property is not only recognized, but so far guaranteed by the Constitution as to impose upon the Federal Government the duty of restoring to his owner the slave who may escape into another State or Territory of the United States. For years past this constitutional obligation has been not only repudiated by some of the non-slaveholding States, but political parties have been organized in all with the avowed object of liberating the slave, and thus not only depriving the South of this vast amount of property, but subjecting it to all the horrors which would necessarily result from such a consummation. In addition to all this, while the abolitionists on the one hand, openly avow their opposition to the Constitution and their desire to destroy a Government which imposes obligations repudiated by them, on the other hand many Southern men, goaded by the incessant attacks of their Northern fellow-citizens upon their feelings, their property, and their constitutional rights, express the belief that the interests of the South would be more effectively protected by a separation of the slave from the non-slaveholding States, and therefore rather promote than interpose to prevent a result so calamitous. We have hitherto disregarded the danger which such a state of feeling and such a course of action would indicate as most imminent, because we have assumed that such sentiments would necessarily occasion a dissolution of the Union. But now, when this sectional exasperation has been made available for the inauguration of a party calling itself Republican, under whose banner, for the first time in the history of the country, this sectional opposition to Southern rights and interests have united in nominating, with alleged probabilities of success, a purely sectional ticket for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States, we can no longer shut our eyes to the reality of the threatened danger; we cannot but feel that the success of such a party would be the death knell of the Union. The unpatriotic purposes of this sectional party are too manifest. Many of its supporters avow their object and purpose to be disunion, and have even gone so far in the madness of their fanaticism as to deprecate the flag of our country by obliterating from its constellation the fifteen stars which represent the slaveholding States, and displaying as their party banner that flag with but sixteen of its stars remaining, to represent the sixteen non-slaveholding States. It is manifest that those who disavow the object are not ignorant of the inevitable result.

The Whigs of Maryland, whom I have the honor to address, need no proof to convince them that calamitous consequences would flow from the success of this sectional party. They each and all know that the election of Mr. Fremont, and the administration of the Government by him upon the principles of his party, would necessarily occasion a dissolution of the Federal Union, to which they have been taught to look as the source of national strength and of individual prosperity and happiness.

I have known only the Whigs of my State too long, I estimate their patriotism too highly, I have associated with them too intimately, to suppose it necessary for a moment to offer an argument to them in behalf of their country. They appreciate, as fully as I could depict, the horrors of disunion; they will see the loss of national strength, the internal dissensions, the fatal check to civilization and freedom, the contempt of the world which would be the consequences of such a calamity. The Whigs of Maryland, who have followed the lead of such patriots as Clay and Webster, "will never keep step to any other music than that of the Union."

It therefore only remains to inquire what course shall be taken to rebuke sectional fanaticism and preserve our country from the dangers of its success.

You are aware that this Republican party

which we all agree must be put down at all hazards, is opposed by two other party organizations: the American, headed by Messrs. Fillmore and Donelson, and the Democratic, led on by Messrs. Buchanan and Breckinridge. You will recollect that Mr. Fillmore, prior to his recent visit to Europe, abandoned the Whig party and became a member of the former of these organizations, which boasted that it had risen upon the downfall of the Whig party, and which proclaimed that the corruptions of the Whig and Democratic parties constituted the necessity of its existence. You know that he and Andrew Jackson Donelson have been nominated by this party (not by the Whig party) for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, and you will admit that the principles of proscription because of religious opinions, and other reputed tenets of this new party, are in direct antagonism with the principles of that good old Whig party to which we are still attached, and which has been abandoned by Mr. Fillmore. It is not my object in referring to these facts to deny to the American party, since the accession of its abolition adherents, a fair claim to nationality; nor to deny the patriotism and virtue of Mr. Fillmore, nor his eminent qualifications for the office of Chief Magistrate. But I do deduce from them the necessary conclusion that, as Whigs, we owe party allegiance to Messrs. Fillmore and Donelson, members and nominees of the American party. I deduce the conclusion that, as Whigs, we are not only at liberty, but that as patriots we are bound, by every obligation to our country and posterity, to throw aside, on the one hand, the feelings of hostility which Mr. Fillmore's desertion of our party would be calculated to engender, and, on the other, and to forget for the time our former battles with the Democratic party, and to ask ourselves but one question—*which of the two national organizations offers the best guarantee of success in crushing out of existence this new and monstrous sectional party, which threatens the life of our country?* I do not propose to examine the relative claims of the two national parties, or their nominees to our support. It is not, in my judgment, permissible in the present crisis to interpose our individual differences of opinion upon minor questions. It is sufficient for us to know that the election of either national nominee would secure the Union; and the only question permitted by patriotism is, whether our support of the one or the other would more certainly prove successful?

But before I proceed to this inquiry, having shown that no political allegiance to Messrs. Fillmore and Donelson will interpose to prevent the fair exercise of our judgment on that side, I propose briefly to inquire whether there is anything to prevent our support of the Democratic nominees, if such course should be taken, shall believe that our vote in their favor would more certainly secure the safety of our country. It cannot have escaped your observation that the political principles upon which the Whig and Democratic parties have battled for thirty years, with varied success, have been for the most part settled by the fiat of the people, and that such as have not been so definitely disposed of have been either abandoned by one or adopted by the other of those parties; so that now the representatives of the people in the halls of State and Federal legislation are found indiscriminately advocating and opposing the same principles and measures. Not only is there no principle of political antagonism which should prevent Whigs and Democrats acting together for the benefit of the common country, but it is confidently submitted that upon the only vital question, that which now agitates and endangers the country, the two parties fully accord. The Whig and Democratic platforms upon the slavery question in eighteen hundred and fifty-two were identical; and, there being no Whig nominees before the people, it might be supposed that consistency would rather require than oppose the support of the Democratic nominees by Whigs. The controlling inquiry to the patriot now recurs, *which of the two national organizations can by its vote be made most certainly successful?*

Every Maryland Whig will be bound by every tie of duty to vote as his judgment shall decide this question.

It may not be immaterial to observe that neither of the national nominees will obtain throughout this broad land any votes which will not be cast by national conservative citizens, and it is to be regretted that in this crisis that vote should be divided between two national candidates, whilst the entire anti-slavery vote will be concentrated upon the sectional nominees. To judge of the relative strength of the two national organizations, it is unnecessary to trace minutely the origin of the American party. It is sufficient to bring to your recollection that it was originally composed, North and South, of the dissatisfied members of the two old parties, and that in the North its original members were chiefly those who opposed the conservative principle upon the slavery question avowed in the platform of the two old parties. It must not escape your recollection that upon the nomination of Messrs. Fillmore and Donelson a large majority of the Northern delegates seceded from the convention, declared their intention not to support those nominees, and subsequently united in the nomination of Mr. Fremont. This separation of the sectional from the national portions of the American party has occurred in every Northern State in the Confederacy. I deduce from these facts the nationality of the supporters of Messrs. Fillmore and Donelson, and I submit the inquiry for the honest decision of those to whom this paper is addressed, *what non-slaveholding State can this national branch of the American party, thus shorn of the larger portion of its original strength, promise its nominees?* Let the Whigs of Maryland ponder upon the view of this subject I have endeavored to present to their consideration, and no one of them will say that a single non-slaveholding State is certain for Fillmore and Donelson. Time, I think, will develop the fact that Messrs. Fillmore and Donelson will be left without an electoral ticket in most of the free States, and it is at any rate the deliberate conviction of my judgment that they will carry a single non-slaveholding State in the Union. If I am right, or even approximate the truth in the view I have taken, it will necessarily follow that any conservative vote for the American nominees North will be equivalent to a vote cast in behalf of the conservative nominees of Mr. Buchanan, his only real competitor.

It is clear, then, that to the South alone can the friends of Messrs. Fillmore and Donelson look for the probable chance of an electoral vote; and it is to the States of Maryland, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Missouri that they profess to look with the greatest hope of success. It is manifest that if this hope were realized, it might indeed prevent the election of Messrs. Buchanan and Breckinridge by the people, but it would only throw the election of President into the present House of Representatives, composed as that House now is. Does not the election of this same House, after a contest of two months, of a Black Republican Speaker, admonish us of the danger of such

an experiment? Who can doubt that our political fabric would be shaken to its very foundations by this election of President being thrown upon the present House of Representatives? On the other hand, it is not certain, beyond the contingency of a doubt, that the vote of the States indicated for Mr. Buchanan, when added to that of the other Southern States, would secure his election and the consequent safety of the Union? It is obvious that in this condition of the canvass, the only serious contest is that between Fremont and Buchanan; that the only possible result that the most sanguine of the friends of Fillmore and Donelson can hope to attain is to carry the contest into the House of Representatives. Who can conceive anything more fatal to the peace of the country, more insane in political action, than such a course of conduct leading to such a result? Suppose Mr. Fillmore to reach the House of Representatives with the votes of four or five States, (his utmost possible strength,) no man seriously contending that he would be elected President, and assuredly few will be found bold enough to assert that, under such circumstances, he ought to be. The only effect, then, of giving the electoral vote of any portion of the South to Mr. Fillmore would be to transfer the contest between Mr. Buchanan and Fremont from the hustings to the House of Representatives; and the danger to our country, now sufficiently menacing, would, in that event, be appalling indeed. Who can contemplate the occurrence of such a contingency, without feeling that he would be a traitor to his country, if he failed to exert every possible effort to avert so awful a calamity?

I deem it, then, to be my duty, as well as that of all who believe with me, that the election of Fremont would be the death-knell of the Union, to unite in the support of Messrs. Buchanan and Breckinridge; and I shall sustain their election to the best of my ability. Whilst I concede that there are certain principles hitherto professed by the party which nominated them that cannot be decently set apart, yet on the great issues of the constitutional rights of the South the platform, on which they stand meets my cordial approval, and is in accordance with that of the party which I now address, and to whose kind favor I owe the honor of holding the seat I now occupy, and which I shall cease to hold after the 4th of March next by the fiat of the party to which Mr. Fillmore has attached himself, and which is now dominant in the Legislature of my native State.

Let Maryland Whigs remember that the political battle now being fought is one of the deepest interest to them; that the maintenance of the constitutional rights of the South is the issue tendered to the American people by the Democratic party, and (as the Whigs have no candidate) by the party which they stand upon this issue the Republican party have stated the Union; and in such a battle, upon such an issue, they must be true to those who are doing battle in our behalf. It would be indeed sad, if, in such a contest, the conservative strength of the country should not be united; it would be as strange as and if, in such a contest, Southern men should not be found battling shoulder to shoulder for the maintenance of their own constitutional rights.

In thus accomplishing what I believe to be a duty, I shall be inexpressibly gratified if I shall find myself sustained by the approval of my fellow-Whigs, who have refused to abandon either the party or the principles in support of which we have so long and so nobly united, and which we have so bravely and so bravely reorganized as soon as our common efforts shall have succeeded in averting the perils that now threaten our beloved country.

THOMAS G. PRATT.

Partisan Origin of the Fugitive Slave Law.

The Boston Courier gives the following bits of history, from which it appears that the practice of restoring fugitives from service had its origin among the old Puritans:

It is interesting to the readers of these papers, as a piece of curious antiquarianism, to know the origin of the practice of restoring fugitives from service. In the articles of confederation between the United Colonies of New England, viz: Massachusetts, New Plymouth, Connecticut, New Haven, &c., made in 1643, and made, as the preamble declares, by those who "call come into these parts of America with a mind to settle, and to live in peace and unity, and to be governed by the laws of God and man, and to advance the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to enjoy the liberties of the gospel in purity and peace"—there is the following provision: "It is also agreed that if any servant runs away from his master into any confederate jurisdiction, in such case, upon certificate from one magistrate in the jurisdiction out of which the servant ran, or upon other due proof, the said servant shall be delivered to his master, or any other that pursues and brings such certificate or proof."

It thus appears, says the Courier, that the rendition of fugitives from services in this country commenced more than two hundred years ago, and what is remarkable, the mode of procedure is precisely analogous to the mode prescribed by the act of 1850; the only difference between them being the more elevated character of the tribunal "in the jurisdiction out of which the servant fled," before the proof is now made, and the greater celerity in the proceedings. It is presumed that the effect of the compact between the Colonies, were rather what we now call a *modus vivendi* than a treaty, and that it was very few than negro slaves, who, in 1643, were very few in number. It was very common in those early times, more than at present, for master mechanics to take indentured apprentices, who, if they absconded, were (and now are) liable to be arrested and returned to their masters, as persons held to labor or service in the State where they first fled.

The same rule prevails now in regard to white fugitives which was adopted by the early Puritans, and is applied by the fugitive slave law to fugitive slaves. Yet the Abolitionists would see the Union dissolved rather than apply the same rule to runaway blacks to which runaway white men are subjected!

Michigan.

We quote from the Detroit Free Press: "If bluff and brag and swagger were the chief elements and evidences of popular strength in this contest, we should say that the electoral vote of Michigan (6 in number) would be given to Fremont. But, thanks to the framers of our system of government, all political contests must be determined by votes, and not by bluff and brag and swagger. This being the fact, the electoral vote of Michigan will, if the Democratic party do its whole duty, be cast for Mr. Buchanan."

"The democracy will do its duty, and the electoral vote of Michigan